p.5

REMARKS

The Office Action of 10/26/2006 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the specification and claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Philips IP&S

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected as being anticipated by Reyes. Claims 3 and 4 were rejected as being unpatentable over Reyes in view of Gasztonyi. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to more clearly define over the cited references. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to make clear that multiple sequential logic circuits are monitored and resulting control signals combined to form a combined control signal. Power consumption of the circuit is controlled based on the combined control signal. No such combination of features is believed to be taught or suggested by the cited references.

Reyes discloses monitoring latches and applying power to the latches only when update is required. Reves is not believed to teach or suggest combining of control signals to form a combined control signal, power consumption of the circuit being controlled based on the combined control signal.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 01/26/2007